



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/758,954	01/16/2004	Albert C. Brown	SVL920065008US2	6184
47069 7590 12/19/2008 KONRAD RAYNES & VICTOR, LLP ATTN: IBM54 315 SOUTH BEVERLY DRIVE, SUITE 210 BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212				
EXAMINER				
NGUYEN, VAN KIM T				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2456				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/19/2008		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

krvuspto@ipmatters.com

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/758,954

**Applicant(s)**

BROWN ET AL.

**Examiner**

Van Kim T. Nguyen

**Art Unit**

2456

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 December 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 18-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 18-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE-08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date December 4, 2008
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Office Action is responsive to communications filed on December 4, 2008.

Claims 18-26 are pending in the case.

#### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on December 4, 2008 has been entered.

#### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

3. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on December 4, 2008, 2008 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statements are being considered by the examiner.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

5. Claims 18-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fish et al. (7,185,317), in view of Cheeniyil et al (US 6,990,664), and further in view of Challenger et al. (US 6,256,712).

Regarding claim 18, Fish discloses:

associating content approval workflow processes with the web site component (blocks 1305-1310, defining workflow stages associating with an access; Figure 13, col. 25: lines 47-63);

detecting an update of the web site component (blocks 1320-1330, checking is performed and update query is updated; col. 26: lines 6-12);

deploying the updated web site component while maintaining referential integrity of the website (block 1340; col. 26: lines 18-19); and

in response to determining that at least one web site component being deployed fails to properly deploy, rolling back the deployment transaction (blocks 1335-1337; col. 26: lines 12-18).

Fish fails to disclose in response to detecting the update, choosing a content approval workflow process from the content approval workflow processes based on at least one of an identity of the updated component, a particular group of component to which the updated component belongs, and a priority level associated with each of the content approval workflow processes; and executing the chosen content approval workflow process to assess whether the updated web site component is approved.

Cheeniyl teaches choosing a content approval workflow process from the content approval workflow processes based on at least one of an identity of the updated component, a particular group of component to which the updated component belongs, and a priority level associated with each of the content approval workflow processes (col. 1: lines 50-56, and col. 2: lines 48-50); and executing the chosen content approval workflow process (col. 2: lines 51-53, and col. 3: lines 1-4).

Fish-Cheeniyl discloses substantially all the claimed limitation, except adding related web site components that have not been selected for deployment to a deployment transaction including the updated website component to enable the related components that depend on the updated component to be properly deployed.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Cheeniyl's method of choosing a workflow based on priority in Fish's system in order to expediting execution of a process.

Fish-Cheeniyl discloses substantially all the claimed limitations, except adding related web site components that have not been selected for deployment to a deployment transaction including the updated website component to enable the related components that depend on the updated component to be properly deployed

Challenger discloses adding related web site components that have not been selected for deployment to a deployment transaction including the updated website component to enable the related components that depend on the updated component to be properly deployed (abstract, and col. 14: lines 45-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Challenger's method of maintaining and making consistent updates to Fish-Cheeniyl' system, motivated by the need to maintain the validity and consistency of the web pages and network.

Regarding claim 19, Fish-Cheeniyl-Challenger also discloses choosing a particular dependent update workflow process to launch based on at least one of a dependent component

that is involved and the component that has been updated (col. 3: lines 20-40); and executing the chosen dependent update workflow process (col. 3: lines 40-44).

Claim 26 is rejected under the same basis as claim 19.

Regarding claims 20-22, Fish-Cheenyil-Challenger also discloses the executing a content approval workflow process comprises executing a content approval workflow process that is capable of including at least one defined operation that asks a participant to accept, edit, or reject, the update to the web site component, wherein detecting an update of a web site component includes detecting of a component, includes detecting a deletion of a component, wherein the attempts to delete the web site component are prevented when other component are dependent on the web site component (i.e., regenerating or deleting objects 3004. The cache manager 1 maintains the underlying structure and keeps tracks of the dependencies between objects. If the cache manager 1 is notified of a change to Table 1, it would either invalidate (or update) page 1, obviously based on whether the dependencies between the objects are clear or not; Challenger: col. 9: lines 1-20, col. 29: line 60 – col. 30: line 6, and col. 31: line 31 - col. 32: line 2).

Regarding claims 23-25, Fish-Cheenyil-Challenger also discloses executing a content approval workflow process includes identifying at least one association between the updated component and at least one of a plurality of defined workflow processes (e.g., identifying the dependency information before either distributing or deleting object 3004; Challenger: col. 31: line 31 - col. 32: line 2).

***Conclusion***

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Van Kim T. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-3073. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on 571-272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Van Kim T. Nguyen  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2456

vkn

/Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2456